

therein". The hook 40 of Waltz is not a clamping block, it is movable from a receiving position (the lower hook in Fig. 2) to a clamping position (the upper hook in Fig. 2). The hook moves against a détente 46 in Waltz. This is not what applicant is claiming and the structure for clamping in Waltz is entirely different from what applicant is claiming.

In rejecting claim 3, the examiner states that "Waltz discloses the clamping block moves in an up and down manner --see for example figures 1 and 2". This is not understood. There is no disclosure in Waltz that any of the **hooks 40** move in an up and down manner. The examiner is challenged to show how this is possible.

In rejecting claim 4, the examiner states that "Waltz discloses the clamping block moves in a side by side manner --via item 14 as seen in Fig. 2". Where in Fig. 2 does Waltz disclose such a movement? The item 14 in Waltz is a clamping device that clamps the overall retention system to a gunwale of a boat. This is not the structure claimed in claim 4.

In rejecting claim 5, the examiner states that "Waltz discloses there are at least two clamping blocks". The examiner is correct.

In rejecting claim 6, the examiner states that "Waltz discloses each of the clamping blocks is spring biased into a clamping position. The examiner is correct. However the clamping in Waltz is altogether different from what has been claimed in previous claims.

In rejecting claim 7, the examiner states that "Waltz discloses means for arresting the clamping blocks into a non-clamping position--see at 50 - 52 in figure 2". This is not true. Waltz does not have such means at all. The elements 50 - 52 are biasing means for clamping the fishing rods into position not means for arresting into a non-clamping position as claimed in claim 7.

In rejecting claim 8, the examiner states that "Waltz discloses that the non-clamping position is released by a single latch release". Since Waltz does not have

any means for arresting in a non-clamping position. there cannot be any release by ant single latch release as is claimed, there is none. 50 - 54 is not such a latch release.

Claims 1 - 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 4,897,952 to Hawie.

In referring to claim 1, the examiner states that "Hawie discloses a multiple fishing rod detention system comprising at least two retention blocks at 24, 26', spaced form each other --see figure 1, each of the retention blocks having bores therethrough for receiving ends of fishing rods --see figure 1, each of the bores having means --42,46', 64-74, for clamping a fishing rod disposed therein".

Hawie does not clamp the fishing rods in the so-called bores. The fishing rods merely lie in the inner surface of the bracket 16. See the relative sizes between the fishing rod and the bracket 16' on the right side of Fig. 1. No clamping takes place.

In rejecting claim 2, the examiner states that "Hawie discloses means for clamping includes a clamping block --at 64, the clamping block is movable relative to each of the retention blocks to obstruct the bore to trap the fishing rod therein --see for example figures 6 - 7".

As mentioned above, Hawie does not disclose any clamping at all. Figs. 4 - 7 disclose how the retention circle 26' can be opened or closed by way of a spring latch to retain or trap any fishing rod within the circle 26'. Again, no clamping or obstructing the bore takes place.

In rejecting claim 3, the examiner states that "Hawie discloses the clamping block moves in an up or down manner". Where is this happening or disclosed in Hawie?

In rejecting claim 4, the examiner states that "Hawie discloses the clamping block moves in a side to side manner". Where is this happening or disclosed in Hawie? The examiner must identify these elements or features when rejecting

claims.

In rejecting claim 5, the examiner states that "Hawie discloses there are at least two clamping blocks. The examiner is correct.

In rejecting claim 6, the examiner states that "Hawie discloses each of the clamping blocks is spring biase --at 66,72, into a clamping position --see for example figures 6 - 7". As stated above, in Hawie no clamping of the fishing rods takes place. The spring biased latches in Figs. 6 and 7 merely open or close a retention circle, but no clamping takes place.

In rejecting claim 7, the examiner states that "Hawie discloses means for arresting the clamping blocks in a non-clamping position --see 46', 70 in Figs. 6 and 7." The examiner is incorrect in this observation. 46' in Fig. 6 is a latch that keeps the ring 26' or 61 closed in a closed position. See how 46' enters the slot 42 to close the ring. This is not what applicant is claiming.

In rejecting claim 8, the examiner states that "Hawie discloses the non-clamping position is released by a single latch release. This is not true in Hawie. The movable latch, that either opens or closes the ring, is either open or closed. See Fig. 2 (open) and Fig. 1 (both rings are closed).

In view of all of the above, the examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as fully anticipated by either Waltz or Hawie. It has been proven that claims 1 - 8 cannot read on either of the references and therefore, are not anticipated.

Rickie A. Bowerman

Date: